

CC 96-262

From: Marshall & Anita Strong <mlstrong@earthlink.net>
To: A7.A7(sness)
Date: February 14, 1997 3:48am
Subject: [Fwd: Proposed Internet User Fees being attempted by Organized Telephone Corporations!]

Received: from greece.it.earthlink.net (greece-c.it.earthlink.net [204.250.46.38]) by latvia.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with ESMTP id VAA06139 for <mlstrong@earthlink.net>; Thu, 13 Feb 1997 21:36:08 -0800 (PST)

Received: from MARSHALL (ip103.lafayette.la.pub-ip.psi.net [38.14.39.103]) by greece.it.earthlink.net (8.7.5/8.7.3) with SMTP id VAA22447; Thu, 13 Feb 1997 21:35:12 -0800 (PST)

Message-ID: <33042289.31EE@earthlink.net>

Date: Fri, 14 Feb 1997 00:30:02 -0800

From: Marshall & Anita Strong <mlstrong@earthlink.net>

Reply-To: mlstrong@earthlink.net

X-Mailer: Mozilla 3.0 (Win16; U)

MIME-Version: 1.0

Followup-To: fccinfo@fcc.gov

To: isp@fcc.gov

CC: fccinfo@fcc.gov

Subject: Proposed Internet User Fees being attempted by Organized Telephone Corporations!

Content-Type: text/plain; charset=us-ascii

Content-Transfer-Encoding: 7bit

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To ALL whom it DOES concern:

First, if you don't know what the subject above is about, please read the attached msg which sparked my response. I have attached it to insure context for my email.

My family, my friends, and I am SERIOUSLY UPSET, ANGRY, ETC. at the posted email notice I just recieved (attached below for your reference).

I am a loyal taxpayer, a Master's graduate, a productive scientific & technical specialist, and I have a background in computers, teaching college courses, and interest

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: <r80dave@athenet.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 13, 1997 6:22pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

David T. Wiener (r80dave@athenet.net) writes:

Dear Commisioner Chong,

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

First let me say thank you for having an address available for voicing concerns. It indeed seems strange that the other commisioners do not have their e-mail address listed even though there is a message welcoming us to the FCC page.

Next I would like to address the issue of charging a per minute fee by local phone commpanies. I do not feel that is either fair nor resonable to do so for either local calls or for accessing the internet. In today's world the phone company is already charging a fee for everything that you can possibly think of. If a person is paying for unlimited calling they should be entitled to unlimited calling. If the phone company wants to enter the free enterprise market of providing internet service let them provide the modems and the necessary employees to compete with the other companies out there. DO NOT let them make money off computer users who are simply connecting to a provider. This would be the epitome of skimming off someones elses work. Let the phone companies enter the competion for internet business like everyone else. Let them be competitive with everyone elses rates. DO NOT let them skim off the hard work of others, to do so would indeed be unfair.

Finally I would request that you pass along this letter to the other members of the FCC who do not see fit to provide an easy venue to e-mail them. Even though they seem to promote the web usage they don't practice it themselves with an easy e-mail address like you do. Thank you for providing an address.

Sincerely,
David T. Wiener

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: pm-at-2-23.athenet.net
Remote IP address: 204.120.6.123

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: Sandra Hugus <pandemo@netins.net>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 13, 1997 5:32pm
Subject: Fcc ruling: docket 96-263

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

To Whom It May Concern,

The Federal Communications Commission was approached by local telephone companies to implement additional charges for internet access via telephone lines. This is totally unacceptable. There should be no difference in the rates between the use of the lines for voice versus data and accessing the internet.

This request by the local phone companies appears to be generated by greed.

The local phone companies would not be asking for this rate increase if the issue was access for additional voice technology. Perhaps, the real issue is that the local phone companies have not kept their technologies current especially with data lines and, therefore, wish to do this now with inappropriate charges on the use of voice lines for data and accessing the internet. New technologies are becoming available for data transfer and accessing the internet, however, these technologies are not universally available to all Americans.

Allowing the local telephone companies permission to charge addition fees for data and internet access will hurt our entire economy. Businesses, both large and small, will pass the increase to consumers. Consumers will pay more for goods and services as a result of this action. In addition, the internet is a magnificent tool for information, yet many citizens will not be able to pay the additional fees. Educational access to the internet for our children, adolescents, and adults will be compromised if fees for access are implemented. Educational budgets throughout the United States are limited whether private, public or primary education or college education. The negative domino effect from this request is enormous.

In summary, I emplor you to deny this request by the local telephone companies and allow the current flat rate structure which the local telephone companies are currently using whether for voice or data or internet access.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sandra Hugus, independent voter

San pandemo@netins.net

Soon to come: <http://www.netins.net/showcase/pandemonium> <ftp://ftp.netins.net/showcase/pandemonium>
<gopher://gopher.netins.net/showcase/pandemonium>

CC: J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(jquello,rchong),FCCMAIL.SMTP(...

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: Joanne F. Goldberg <jfg@world.std.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 16, 1997 8:57pm
Subject: Docket #: 96-262

FEB 17 1997

CC 96-262

Dear Ms. Chong:

If the local telephone companies succeed in their request to the FCC for "per-minute" charges for use of the Internet, the number of lives which I am able to save in a routine day---attributable in large part to the affordable hourly Internet rates currently available to me---will drop dramatically.

I spend 5-6 hours of every day "talking" via e-mail to perfect strangers whose lives are hanging in the balance as they struggle to be the victor, rather than the vanquished, in their battles with cancer. This, in addition to my regular (paid) workload, consumes most of my waking hours on weekends as well, as I endeavor to troubleshoot and route cancer patients to the most advanced care available to them.

If "per minute" time charges are instituted for calls to the Internet--which is the lifeline between me and the countless strangers who find their way to my cyberdoor---I will be unable to continue to donate my time and expertise to help others survive this ghastly disease, as I have been so fortunate to do.

Below is perhaps one of the more dramatic examples of a situation in which I provided information to a patient where the patient's physician had not, and the information which I provided gave that patient an extension, if not a new lease, on life. I'll let you listen in on what the patient, herself, has to say, via the Internet:

>>#: 267881 S3/Breast Cancer [CANCER]
19-Dec-96 21:21:12
Sb: #HER2 Is Working
To: All

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Today I got an early Christmas gift, the best I've ever had.

I've been on the experimental monoclonal antibody, HER2 for 11 weeks.
A CT Scan done Tuesday shows the tumors on my liver have diminished in size.
My prayers have been answered.

Does anyone know how to reach Joanne Goldberg? She got me information on this last Winter and I'd like to thank her.

Elaine<<

>>To: Joanne F Goldberg <jfg@world.std.com>
Subject: Re: Good News Indeed!
Status: R

Hi Joanne,

I've been wanting to chat with you since I started the treatment in October. I completed my initial trial today in Birmingham, AL (the Compassionate Program). My doctor there was thrilled with the results. I have been flying to B'ham and back every Monday for 12 weeks now getting a Navelbine infusion (depending on my blood counts) on Tuesday morning within 24 hours of the HER2. We are not absolutely sure if it's the HER2 or Navelbine or combination, but I've had much more HER2 than Navelbine. I will continue my weekly trips indefinitely now.

Side effects with HER2 - NONE. With Navelbine many, I've gotten extremely anemic requiring red cell transfusions twice and am on Neupogen just about all the time with exception of chemo day. The Navelbine has also caused my stomach to develop erosive gastritis, but with the wonderful results I'm getting I can handle the side effects. In September after completing radiation to spine for bone mets, my liver tumors went wild, my pleural effusion got bigger and and I peritoneal fluid causing severe pain and had to go on MS Contin. Now all liver tumors are diminished, fluid is completely gone, and pleural effusion gone.

Joanne, I want to thank you for all your help. It took me a while after you gave me the info. I had to discuss with my onc here in Houston and get her concurrence. I made so many phone calls but it has all paid off. The drug is in Phase III now and it will probably be 1998 before FDA approved. I've heard so many miracle stories about HER2. My doctors in Houston are very excited about the monoclonal antibodies.

My best to you Joanne. Have a wonderful holiday and all God's blessings in the new year.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

Elaine<<

Ms. Chong, this woman likely would *not* have lived to see another Christmas, had she not learned about the new HER2 treatment, had strangers in cyberspace not been there to prod her (and in turn, her doctors) into this lifesaving initiative.

"Now all liver tumors are diminished, fluid is completely gone, and pleural effusion gone."

This is an astonishing turnaround for a patient with advanced metastatic breast cancer, and it resulted from nothing more than the fortuitous connectivity between two strangers on the Internet. Fortunately, the cost of donating my time (and the expertise which I can offer) remains reasonable at the moment. If the charges for reaching out to such strangers increase substantially---as I believe they will in the event that the local telephone companies are able to effect the change to "per minute" charges for Internet use---my own activities will have to be curtailed, along with those of many others who volunteer their time and professional experience similarly to help people cope with such catastrophic events as cancer.

Please, Ms. Chong, I implore you and the other FCC Commissioners to consider carefully the cost of acceding to rank greed of the local phone companies. It's us small folk who try to have an impact upon humanity--one life at a time--who will lose in the end. Unless, of course, one of the Baby Bell execs should ever find him- or herself in need of such lifesaving information as above; in that case, the cost of a better next quarter's earnings will, I suspect, have proven too dear, even for those who stand to profit from it most; there simply will be none of us left out there who can afford to reach out to save a life.

I thank you in advance for your thoughtful consideration.

Very truly yours,

Joanne F. Goldberg jfg@world.std.com

300 Commercial Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109

CC96-262

From: <rmaixner@airmail.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 16, 1997 5:15pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

FEB 17 1997

Richard Charles Maixner (rmaixner@airmail.net) writes:

Dear Commissioner Chong

It has come to my attention that the phone companies are lobbying the FCC to allow per minute rates to be charged against Internet users. I feel that this is another attempt by the phone companies to reak more profits of of the backs of all computer users. I feel that this is unfair and will eventually be seen as a tax favoring the rich over the poor on access to information on the internet. I feel that the Internet should have access such as the public has to libraries. Nobody should be deprived of important information because of high profit user fees levied by the phone companies.

I would like to know what you can do about this situation. I am in favor of stopping the phone company lobbies from getting what they want. Please let me know where y ou stand on this issue.

Sincerely

Richard C. Maixner
10926 Carissa Dr.
Dallas, TX. 75218

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: dal47-2.ppp.iadfw.net
Remote IP address: 206.138.230.191

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: John Chek <koz@netwalk.com>
To: J1.J1(FCCMAIL),A7.A7(jquello,sness,rchong)
Date: February 15, 1997 9:41am
Subject: Access Charge Reform

In the Matter of Access Charge Reform (96-262)

It is my understanding that the above initiative on Internet Access Charge Reform will lead to costly internet access. I think this is an outrage, it is wrong to use higher phone rates to deny people of the world greatest resource of information. If I am mis-informed please tell me,
I would be very pleased to know that the phone companies are not going to try to take advantage of millions of internet users who are already paying plenty for the phone time.

A Concerned Student, John

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <dclark@freeppp.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 15, 1997 12:03am
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

Dale Hatton (dclark@freeppp.com) writes:

(CC Docket No. 96-263).

Internet access needs to get off of the slow and inefficient problem ridden POTS (switched) lines.

Local access to ISPs should be by efficient, flat rate, fast packet switched digital lines.

Incentives should be the money the business would make by charging fees for providing fast clean problem free digital access to the world of on-line business and education (internet).

The local monopolies (baby bells) need to stop crying and start investing in new and cost effective packet switched digital technology.

Or get out of the way of companies that will.

The baby bells need to (be forced to) open up there transmission lines to other companies and end there monopolies.

Concerned Parent

Dale C. Hatton
2630 Social Band Rd.
Campbellsville KY 42718
<dclark@freeppp.com>

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: Remote IP address: 205.152.145.55

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

From: <LCDINFL@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(RCHONG)
Date: February 17, 1997 4:33pm
Subject: Re: Phone Co/Internet access ...

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC 96-262

Dear Commissioner Chong,

Thank you for the courtesy of your reply; however, there is a problem. You wrote:

>>> I urge you to file comments in this proceeding. You can find it by going to the FCC's web page (www.fcc.gov), selecting the Common Carrier Bureau, and looking for the new Notice of Inquiry in Docket 96-262 on development of broadband systems. <<<<

I cannot access the Internet re: the above. I felt my comments to you were sufficient. Where else can my comments be sent via e-mail and to what address?

Needless to say, I am extremely concerned. We have invested an enormous amount of money in developing 4 website services. If the FCC -whatever cockamamie BS reason the phone companies have given- grants a per minute charge OR ANY CHARGE to consumers for using these lines to access the internet (which alone sounds idiotic, as does R&D rhetoric coming from them), we are hung & will be swinging from the rafters with 100's of thousands of dollars LOST. I am sure we are a drop in the bucket, for there are thousands of others like us who will also "lose their shirts" financially.

It is my understanding (from a local phone company exec) that what the phone companies are really upset about are the multitudes of "homepages" on the Net set up by Foo-Foo the cat's owner and the "Jones Family Calendar" sort of nonsense appearing on the Net. Still in all, what does that have to do with wanting to charge everyone access fees - other than plain old PHONE COMPANY *GREED* ? Isn't it obvious to the FCC that recently the phone companies reduced the charges for Information from 55-75 cents down to 35 cents - b/c people were accessing the Internet to get a phone number instead of *paying* good old Bell South, et al?

NOW they want to boo-hoo in the FCC's ears using some "development" baloney to hoodwink the FCC into affirming charges for MORE money. For what? How about to make up for losses DUE to the Internet - and, excuse me, but the day the phone companies LOSE money, I'll eat my hat and yours. They are GREEDY and want more every day. They "care" about no one and nothing other than INcreasing business . . . out of our pockets.

Thank you -
Lynn-Claire Davis

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

CC96-262

From: James D. Boone <jboone@phys.ksu.edu>
To: J1.J1(FCCMAIL)
Date: February 18, 1997 10:15am
Subject: Proposal to charge internet providers.

FEB 18 1997

It is my belief that this proposal to charge internet service providers is unreasonable. All this charge per MINUTE will do will make it so the only people who can enjoy the internet are the wealthy, once again making freedom of speech and expression left only for those who can AFFORD their freedoms. How many more rights are we gonna put a price on? It is my request that this does not pass, thank you for your time.

jboone@phys.ksu.edu http://www.eece.ksu.edu~jboone

CC: A7.A7(rchong,sness,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre)

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <vangsls@tiac.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 18, 1997 8:16am
Subject: new telephone charge

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

>Date: Tue, 18 Feb 1997 07:34:47

>To: isp@fcc.gov

>From: vangsls@tiac.net

>Subject: new telephone charge

>

>I have just learned that our local telephone utility is pressing the FCC for a new 'on line' time measurement charge for individuals and small companies who are involved with personal computers.

>

>I, as a small business owner, who just barely ekes out a 'head-above-water' living, strongly protest such a new charge. I sincerely request that such charges be disallowed. The telephone utilities are not hurting!! Why pick on the small person. Let them increase their rates to the many, many wholesalers who are becoming more dominant.

>

>Very truly yours,

>

>Thomas W. Trainor

>

Vanguard Sales & Marketing Associates
Tom Trainor, President
16A West Main Street
New Salem, MA 01355
Tel: 508-544-8911
Fax: 508-544-6440
E-Mail: vangsls@tiac.net

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <ninnie@ime.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 5, 1997 9:47pm
Subject: Comments from Commissioner Chong's Homepage

FEB 6 1997

Marsha Bokleman (ninnie@ime.net) writes:

I understand that the FCC is considering a per minute access fee being brought to you by the phone companies.

My view is that we pay a monthly phone bill and a fee to our service provider for our access to the internet and that should be all we pay. That is quite enough.

It is difficult for people to buy the computer and pay a monthly fee (my grandchildren here in Maine do not have a computer, their single parent mother works very hard to provide for them, so they use my computer).

I believe that the phone companies feel that fewer long distance call will be made cutting into their revenue. Perhaps it will, but they are also generating new revenue by providing internet access. I would think that the organization that would be complaining would be the post office. If anything e-mail would cut them out of the loop, we still will use the phone to talk directly to someone, or for quick contact. There are a lot of things you can call e-mail, but private and fast are not 2 of them!! Please consider my comments. Do not cut the middle class out of internet access.

Thank-you.
MVB

Server protocol: HTTP/1.0
Remote host: port-135.ime.net
Remote IP address: 207.41.16.185

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

0096-262

From: Bernard M Chachula <bchachula@juno.com>
To: J1.J1(bettyfre,FCCMAIL),A7.A7(rchong,sness,gclark)
Date: February 18, 1997 9:35pm
Subject: Internet Access Policy

I am told that the FCC is accepting public comment on the issue of per minute charges for local calls, a solution ostensibly prompted by the recent popularity of the internet and the perception that without a change the nation's telephone systems will soon be overloaded. My comments are that of a private citizen, lacking the extensive study and pseudo-study of commercial commenters. However, I realize that you will exercise the utmost care and deliberation in discerning the appropriate policy solution to this dilemma which appears to possess only polar positions. With this in mind, please consider these points:

The popularity of switched service as a means of accessing the internet may be short-lived as new technologies come on the scene. It would be tragic to institute a sweeping change to a short term demand on capacity, if in fact one exists.

While fairness demands an appreciation of the property rights of the telecommunications interests, the impact of internet usage should not be studied without resort to a broader context, examining overall profitability, positive impact on technology, and societal access considerations. For example, I understand that profits are up because of a surge in second phone lines and that new technology may soon moot the congestion issue. Also, I would suppose that a change for computer users would require similar treatment for persons using the telephone for lengthy periods for ordinary speech. What would be the impact on the poor, on the use of the internet by students or schools?

Approval of such a major pricing policy shift would also cause unexpected shift to other means of data transfer, perhaps irreparably jeopardizing the very telephone interests which clamor for this change. I hasten to say, save them from their own folly!

Thank You.

Bernard M. Chachula

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

CC: FCCMAIL.SMTP("Thomas.J.Lucente@juno.com","Jr.@juno...

FEB 18 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: Sneddon, William K <SneddoWK@ASC-YW.WPAFB.AF.MIL>
To: 'isp@fcc.gov' <isp@fcc.gov>
Date: February 19, 1997 8:04am
Subject: Do NOT allow Per-minute fee for Telephone Companies

Dear Federal Communications Commission-

Please do NOT allow the U.S. telephone companies the ability to charge a per-minute fee to Internet service providers. The cost of ISP lines is still too high compared to other industrialized countries of the world. The \$1.4 billion in revenue for only \$245 million in work (a 5:1 profit ratio) shows that the telephone monopolies still require price control.

In summary, you control the communication monopolies, they are charging too much, please do NOT allow a per-minute fee.

Thank You
- Wm Kyle Sneddon

CC: 'sness@fcc.gov' <sness@fcc.gov>

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEB 19 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <Brunrj@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong,sness,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre,FCCMAIL)...
Date: February 19, 1997 5:05pm
Subject: Surcharge on Phone Calls accessing The Internet

Please don't allow the phone companies to charge by the minute to calls that access the internet. The phone companies are making a lot of money off extra lines installed for modem access already.

I will likely minimize my time on line if this happens.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FEB 19 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

0096-262

From: <PDemirj247@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 20, 1997 11:13am
Subject: RATE HIKE

I would like to protest the proposed rate hike for internet providers. The telephone companies have reaped more than 1.4 billion dollars in profits from same. WHay do they need to raise rates?
Thank You

CC: A7.A7(rchong,sness,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre,FCCMAIL)

FEB 20 1997

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: rlbaver <rlbaver@erinet.com>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: February 20, 1997 4:53pm
Subject: Rate Hike

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I just read with disbelief in my local newspaper that the U.S. telephone companies have petitioned the FCC to allow them to charge a per-minute fee to Internet service providers. And, their reason is that they must upgrade their networks because of the growing volume of Internet users.

I am appalled and consequently, I am writing to ask you to reject this rate hike. I ask this because as the Internet Access Coalition reports, this

Internet traffic has actually been a windfall to the telephone companies.

And, that the local telephone companies only spent \$245 million adding 6 million residential telephone lines used primarily for Internet access while reaping \$1.4 billion in revenue on these lines.

Plus, if Internet traffic is so dangerous to these local telephone networks, then why are these telephone companies getting into the business of providing Internet access?

In closing, let me reiterate by again asking you to reject this proposed rate hike.

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Respectfully,

Roy L. Baver

CC: FCC Chairman Reed Hundt <rhundt@fcc.gov>

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: Jim Wright <jwright@erinet.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 22, 1997 10:21am
Subject: Latest telco rape attempt

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Please deny the latest telco attempt to rape the internet through their application for per minute charges to ISPs.
Thank you. Jim Wright

FEB 24 1997

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: <DDARRAH1@aol.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong,sness,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre,FCCMAIL)...
Date: February 23, 1997 5:56pm
Subject: No!! To Access Charges for Internet Usage

Date: February 23, 1997

FEB 24 1997

To: Reed Hundt, Chmn. FCC
James Quello, Commissioner
Andrew Barrett, Commissioner
Susan Ness, Commissioner
Rachelle Chong, Commission

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Subject: Access Charges for Internet Users

Please register my sincere protest against local telephone companies request for the implementation of access charges for internet use. My reasons are as follows:

- Local telephone companies have traditionally earned their income by providing telephone lines and services to individuals and business.

Historically they have levied no charges for line use for local calls.

Local telephone companies have already profited from the growing use of the internet since many users are ordering additional lines to better utilize=

the medium. The telephone companies, in my estimation, have eyed the growing=

use of the internet as an opportunity for them to employ opportunistic =91mon= ey grubbing=92 means to unfairly take advantage of this growing phenomenon. =

Why should the =91rules of the game=92 be changed now to meet the selfish demands of the local providers?

- The internet, while growing, is still in its infancy. Now is not the time to throw impediments to this growth. The internet serves as a great extension to the information reservoir existing in the U.S. and the world.

The information highway makes pools of data available to the masses and nothing should be unfairly employed to hinder the use of this asset.

- The implementation of unfair and selfish access charges would serve to deny the utilization of the internet by the less economically fortunate in our population. It is not only economically disadvantaged individuals who would be deprived of internet usage by unfair access charges, but also small businesses who should increasingly use this medium to enhance their individual competitiveness.

In conclusion, please DO NOT change your ruling prohibiting the imposition of access charges for internet local line usage. This ruling has worked well in the past and there is no reason to change it now.

Sincerely

David R. Darrah
4221 Sillman Place
Kettering, OH 45440

E-Mail: Ddarrah1@aol.com

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <rspencer@shaysnet.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 25, 1997 7:03am
Subject: Internet charges

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Chong,

I urge you to vote against allowing local telephone companies to impose any per minute charges for Internet services. I believe this would place a financial hardship on me and my fellow Net users. To allow per minute charges would hinder my ability to access friends and acquaintances over the Net. Please, vote against this unfair charge.

Sincerely Ross L. Spencer, Jr.

FEB 25 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <rspencer@shaysnet.com>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: February 25, 1997 7:03am
Subject: Internet charges

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Dear Commissioner Chong,

I urge you to vote against allowing local telephone companies to impose any per minute charges for Internet services. I believe this would place a financial hardship on me and my fellow Net users. To allow per minute charges would hinder my ability to access friends and acquaintances over the Net. Please, vote against this unfair charge.

Sincerely Ross L. Spencer, Jr.

1-25-97

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

00 96-262

From: <Momxcubed@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(isp)
Date: March 3, 1997 9:30am
Subject: Telephone companies and internet fees

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I'm quite upset that telephone companies are seeking to charge fees for internet usage. From the figures I've seen, the telephone companies are making a great deal of money from increased usage already. Greed is an ugly thing. Please do not be a part of it. Please rule against allowing telephone companies to charge fees for internet usage. Thank you,

Judith A. Hays
2 Rigby Court
Fairborn, OH 45324-1815

CC: A7.A7(rchong,gclark),J1.J1(bettyfre,FCCMAIL)

MAR 5 1997

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

CC 96-262

From: Laura Weatherman <weatherman@pics.net@pics.net>
To: rchong <rchong@fcc.gov>
Date: March 1, 1997 10:35am
Subject: please stop the insanity!

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Mrs. Chong,

Please help put a stop to the local phone com.'s from adding an additional 4-5 cent a min. for accessing the internet. I work from home and this would cause me to shut down. PLEASE STOP THIS>>>>>>>

Mrs. Weatherman

MAR 2 1997

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: <chrism@mail1.pics.net>
To: A7.A7(rchong)
Date: March 1, 1997 8:48am
Subject: surcharge on internet phone service!!

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

I own a small restaurant and do alot of work over the internet.
The internet users of the world are not all playing on the internet.
Many of my friends and associates are on the internet and by no means do any of us break any laws while using the vast resources found on the internet. We all pay our phone bills and we all pay a fee for using the internet as it is. The phone company sees \$\$\$\$\$\$ in their sights and as usual thats what this is all about is money. I regret that the united states has come to this and i hope you consider what passing this bill will do to small business as well as children that use the internet as a learning tool and for the referance.
This will be the fall of the internet!!!Please consider what i have said, and please vote "no" on this. THANK YOU!!

31-3-97

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

CC 96-262

From: Rachelle Chong
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("megamama@ix.netcom.com")
Subject: Internet games/prizes policy -Reply

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Hi Cheryl,

I agree with you that this game does not sound fair. The FCC does not regulate Internet content, so we don't have authority to help you. However, you could lodge your complaint with the Federal Trade Commission in DC, or your local consumer protection agency in your state. I urge you to do so.

Sorry I cannot help further,
Commissioner Rachelle Chong
FCC

MAY 1 1997

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____